

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Jeffrey William Crouchman,

Civil Action No. 9:16-1707-CMC

Petitioner,

vs.

ORDER

Sheriff Steve Lofties,

Respondent.

This matter is before the court on Petitioner's *pro se* application for writ of habeas corpus filed in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On August 5, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the petition for habeas corpus be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return. ECF No. 9. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. The Report was sent to Petitioner on August 5, 2016.¹ ECF No. 10. Petitioner filed a notice of change of address on August 23, 2016, noting that he was released from the Greenville County Jail and that anything mailed to him "after 8-10-16 [he] did

¹ The Order authorizing service of process by the clerk, directing Respondent not to answer and directing Petitioner to notify the clerk in writing of any change of address was also sent to Petitioner on August 5, 2016. As Petitioner appears to have received the Order directing him to notify the court of a change in address, the court assumes he also received the Report mailed with it.

not receive.” ECF No. 11. The court has received no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order and this petition is dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
September 8, 2016

